



BUILDING BLOCKS PROCESS EVALUATION

Final Report

INTERNATIONAL HIV/AIDS ALLIANCE, UK

May 2004

CONTENTS

Executive Summary	3
REPORT	11
Introduction	12
Objectives	12
Methodology	14
Sampling	15
Evaluation Findings – Participation	16
The Process	16
Findings Related to Participation	17
Lessons Learned	24
Evaluation Findings – Content	27
The Process	27
Findings Related to Content	28
Lessons Learned	32
Evaluation Findings – Effectiveness	34
The Process	34
Findings Related to Effectiveness	34
Lessons Learned	36
Evaluation Findings – Planning and Implementation	37
Conclusion	38
Annex 1: Strategic core areas and questions	39
Annex 2: Building Blocks Plan and Objectives	41
Annex 2a: Table showing revised objectives and activities for Participatory Adaptation Guides (PAGS)	43
Annex 3: Document Review Tool	44
Annex 4: Evaluation Matrix	45

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The process evaluation of the Building Blocks resources, consisting of the Africa-wide Briefing Notes and the Participatory Adaptation Guides, was initiated to document and analyse a unique process of resource development. Begun in September 2001, the Building Blocks resources sought wide stakeholder involvement from policy to grassroots in a planned participatory way. This process was adopted to increase relevance and ownership that would logically maximise the use and reach of the resource materials when disseminated.

Broadly, the process evaluation intended to answer two questions retrospectively:

1. Did the process of development meet plans and stated objectives?
2. What were the lessons learned?

Issues related to the reach, use and impact of the resources were **not** addressed. As a result, the process evaluation provides recommendations that are **indicative**, requiring validation when the impact evaluation takes place.

The process evaluation methodology was designed to capture the **guiding principles** of the Building Blocks resource development, providing a framework for developing key questions which could be triangulated across stakeholders:

- **participation** of many stakeholders across different levels – in international, Portuguese-speaking, Francophone and Anglophone countries and communities in Africa;
- **content** development in three languages and adaptation to local realities;
- complex coordination and **management** of the process over a long period of time with many people in different countries;
- **adaptation of plans** for resource development in response to field experience.

The evaluation primarily used interviews to collect data. These included face-to-face and telephone interviews, as well as questionnaires by e-mail. Contact details at country-level proved to be difficult to locate as the evaluation took place about 18 months after the beginning of the Building Blocks development, and questionnaires sent by e-mail required personal follow-up and calls. In addition, a desk review of available documents was also done. In all, 44 people were interviewed – 14 advisory board members and key contributors, 20 members of the Building Blocks development group, four consultants (including language editors) and six members of the International HIV/AIDS Alliance.

Because the Building Blocks development is inextricably linked to the process, the evaluation findings,

- **describe** the processes related to participation, content development and management; and
- **analyse** the responses and present lessons learned as well as recommendations in a matrix.

The Process

USAID initially wanted a 'pocket book' - a practical, easy-to-use toolkit for communities that supported and complemented the USAID/UNICEF *Principles to Guide Programming for orphans and other children affected by HIV/AIDS*. The Alliance negotiated for a change with USAID which resulted in the development of the Building Blocks project – a set of Africa-wide Briefing Notes followed by Adaptation Guides to be used at country-level. The Briefing Notes' six topics of overview, social inclusion, health and nutrition, economic strengthening, education and psychosocial support were zeroed-in using multiple channels – brainstorming with USAID (with some advisory board members) and at the 2001 ICASA Conference in Burkina Faso. The advisory board (consisting of 15 members) represented various organisations and expertise related to orphans and vulnerable children work. It was a 'virtual' team coordinated by the Programme Officer: Children at the Alliance through e-mails and phone calls.

The Alliance developed the first Briefing Notes draft in English following an exhaustive literature review. These were then translated into French and Portuguese, with all three language versions reviewed at a workshop in Uganda in September 2001 by 20 people from ten countries of Anglophone, Portuguese-speaking and Francophone Africa (Senegal, Kenya, Angola, Uganda, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Malawi, Mozambique, Mali and Burkina Faso). The participants at the workshop agreed to take the process forward to their respective countries – 'country-level review' - and validate the revised versions of the Briefing Notes with those who were involved in orphans and vulnerable children work. Comments from the country-level review were synthesised in the UK by the Alliance. Inputs from the advisory board for the Briefing Notes were requested after the Uganda consultation and the country-level review.

The concept and design of the Participatory Adaptation Guides underwent a change following the experience of the Uganda workshop and the country-level review and was discussed with USAID. Instead of country-specific Briefing Notes, the Adaptation Guides would now refer to a set of participatory learning and action tools that would assist communities to translate the Briefing Notes into action. This strategy was adopted because feedback from reviewers indicated that the generic Briefing Notes could be used directly by different countries in policy and programmes. There was also a need expressed that the Adaptation Guides should be for less literate audiences, as the Briefing Notes were available for the literate ones. The Participatory Adaptation Guides' conceptual framework - brainstormed at a meeting in the UK in March 2002 and complemented by a desk study of existing approaches for adapting resources - suggested the way forward.

The first drafts of these Guides were written at a workshop in Kenya, attended by 13 people across three language groups. Each group took two topics (from a total of six) to design the participatory learning and action tools, and later field tested these in their countries. The French and English tools were also field tested at a skills building workshop at the International Conference on AIDS and STIs in Africa during 2003. The testing had been completed at the time of the process evaluation, but the consolidation of the feedback and cross-translation by the Alliance (to make a full set of six) was pending.

Evaluation findings related to *PARTICIPATION* were:

1. The Building Blocks project was innovative because of the involvement of a wide range of partners at different levels – international, country and community-level - early on in the development.
2. Members of the advisory board stated that their inputs contributed to the Building Blocks development. They appreciated the representative nature of the board and the management of the ‘virtual team’ by the Alliance. Some felt that their expertise could have been utilised better.
3. Facilitation and participation at both workshops – Uganda (Briefing Notes) and Kenya (PAG) – were excellent. As a result, participants were able to share experiences, learn about participatory processes, acquire good facilitation skills and build new networks. This contributed to a better ‘engagement’ at the country-level review as well.
4. At the Uganda workshop most participants were from NGOs and had different professional backgrounds. However, the experience and expertise of the participants varied across language groups and affected the quality of their participation.
5. Portuguese-speaking, Anglophone and Francophone African participants at the Uganda and Kenya workshops were able to broaden their understanding of orphans and vulnerable children work in Africa. However, communication across language groups was a problem and translation time consuming.
6. The country-level reviews reached a large number of diverse people because of the high level of commitment of the country coordinators - all of who had been present at the Uganda workshop. The reviews generated more awareness on orphans and vulnerable children issues. Few children and young people were involved in the process.
7. All of those who participated (advisory board, Building Blocks development group, members of the country-level reviews and Participatory Adaptation Guides) indicated a personal value addition in their work as a result of being part of the Building Blocks development process.
8. Workshop members in Uganda and Kenya, as well as country-level review members, felt that others who participated also benefited from the process. For example, in Malawi and Senegal, the Building Blocks were being reviewed to inform government policy on orphans and vulnerable children.

Evaluation findings related to *CONTENT* were:

1. Both the advisory board and development group felt that the Briefing Notes addressed a huge gap in orphans and vulnerable children resources – it addressed several important sectors (through the five topic areas), did so simultaneously and rooted them in local realities (through case studies and examples). The development group felt that the participatory learning and action tools in the Participatory Adaptation Guides were new and useful.

2. The Briefing Notes also addressed a language gap by simultaneously bringing out the resources in three languages and adapting (rather than translating) them.
3. The Portuguese and French Building Blocks went through a process of adaptation but there were few content changes from the original English draft. The major changes in the language versions referred to case studies and examples contributed by the participants.
4. Having numerous contributors for the content resulted in diverse (though not always useful) comments. Because people did not know exactly what they should keep in, they included everything. In some cases, substantial deletion or modification was necessary.
5. Overall the flow was coherent but some felt principles and strategies were confused. Some felt that the English version was clearer and of better quality than the other language versions.
6. The Participatory Adaptation Guides were developed (without a draft) from scratch in three languages, which helped in creative thinking. Because each language group produced only two out of six Guides, they were unable to field test and learn from the other Guides.

Evaluation findings related to *EFFECTIVENESS* were:

1. Building Blocks had an in-built dissemination strategy and the Alliance was very successful in getting the Briefing Notes publications to the people who wanted them - even to those who were not part of the Alliance 'family'. In fact, the Briefing Notes have rapidly been reprinted.
2. Coordinating the large number of small contracts for Building Blocks development and consultation required a lot of management coordination and support at the Alliance.
3. Preparing multilingual resources for publications (especially as adaptations and not translations) was difficult because consistency had to be maintained and was time consuming. The Publications Team had to negotiate editorial decisions in French and Portuguese which affected their own workload. The French and Portuguese versions were published six months after the English one.
4. Coordinating and managing feedback, plus revising and reviewing across ten countries, three languages and diverse stakeholders (including the advisory board) was time-consuming and difficult for the Programme Officer: Children.
5. Some of the countries needed help in the country-level review and 'Field Tests to expedite the process.

Lessons Learned

Related to *PARTICIPATION*

1. The participation of many stakeholders has created greater ownership of the products, more awareness of orphans and vulnerable children issues, and a greater willingness to disseminate it. In many ways the reach of Building Blocks was unexpected - it is not only being used in communities, but also in government policy and as a resource by international organisations and academic institutions, such as Johns Hopkins.
2. Having a virtual advisory board and communicating through e-mails has its limitations. International advisors, because of the unique position they occupy, can contribute in different and multiple ways.
3. Workshop facilitators' use of participatory methodologies helped participants to get hands-on experience when working with others later in-country (country-level review), in communities (field tests, programmes) and with children (field tests, programmes).
4. Who gets involved is important, such as:
 - children and young people;
 - community representatives;
 - political advocates;
 - a diversity of expertise and representation in the workshops.
5. Simultaneous participation of different language groups is valuable and has contributed to a common awareness on orphans and vulnerable children issues and expanded coverage.
6. Dialogue and participation of countries with similar languages and cultures needs to be strengthened in order to share learnings and explore contextual issues.
7. Participating in resource development had diverse value additions not only for those who participated but also for whom they involved/worked with later.

Related to *CONTENT*

1. The Briefing Notes have fulfilled the need for simple, practical resources in orphans and vulnerable children programming. They have been used in many ways – at country-level, with resource organisations and NGOs.
2. Simultaneous language adaptations, though difficult, are valuable to end-users because, in the long run, no one gets 'left out' and all are on the same playing field.
3. The draft restricted creative inputs in all three language groups. Developing a first draft in English made the content relevant to Anglophone Africa and restricted contributions from Francophone and Portuguese-speaking African countries. In addition, experience from the latter was itself limited.
4. When there are many and diverse contributors to content development, editorial responsibility for quality and relevance increases. Coordinating across languages

requires guidance for editorial inputs, especially if it will be represented as an Alliance document.

5. Confusion on principles and strategies is probably a reflection of the current stage of orphans and vulnerable children programming, which is relatively new and evolving. Francophone and Portuguese-speaking Africa have less experience in orphans and vulnerable children work than Anglophone, which may be one reason for the difference in clarity.
6. Cross-fertilisation of ideas is restricted if language groups are involved in only part of the development of resources.

Related to *EFFECTIVENESS*

1. An in-built dissemination strategy ensured that Briefing Notes were known by many and generated demand for the resource.
2. Expectations of field-level persons for participating in content development have to be addressed and systems streamlined to manage multiple, small field-level contracts.
3. Multilingual projects are time consuming and require region-specific language experts for editing purposes. Adaptations particularly require editorial guidelines – what is or is not included – either while it is a work-in-progress or at the final stage of publication. These editorial decisions cannot be made by the publishing team as they are unfamiliar with the issues/context.
4. Managing multi-country and multi-lingual projects requires a team if work is to be completed effectively and efficiently.
5. When publications are dependent on field-level inputs, delays in a few places can affect the timeline of the whole publication.

Recommendations

With regards to **participation** in resource development, it is recommended that:

1. Participatory processes (not just tokenism) are used for resource development, since it brings greater engagement, involvement, buy-in and wider use. A small note regarding the Building Blocks process could be included in the products.
2. Practical mechanisms are found regarding how the advisory board members can work as a team rather than individual members (keeping in mind budget and time constraints).
3. The workshops and other mechanisms for developing resources demonstrate participatory methods and helps participants acquire facilitation skills which, in turn, helps participants to better utilise the resources developed.

4. The board members themselves participate in defining how they can participate and contribute, especially when resources are being developed using a participatory, wide stakeholder approach.
5. End-users are defined carefully so that their participation is built into the process, and that children (in orphans and vulnerable children resource development) participate meaningfully. End-users can include those who will use the resource whom it is for, as well as those who can advocate for it (government representatives).
6. Anglophone policy makers, donors and agencies who have access to more and diverse resources, include other language speaking countries in developing resources, capacity building, programmes and sharing experiences. New technology for simultaneous translation - using mobile, radio microphones and receivers - would facilitate this process.
7. Donors and support agencies provide opportunities for dialogue and assistance within similar language speaking countries and, subsequently, across other languages - in this way contributing their consolidated experience to shape policy.

With regards to *CONTENT* in resource development, it is recommended that:

1. Donors and resource development agencies provide opportunities for end-users to share experiences, recognising the 'ripple' effect on their own work, that of others and on wider networks.
2. Other orphans and vulnerable children issues are identified to develop other practical, simple Briefing Notes.
3. Donors realise the importance of simultaneous adaptations rather than translations and, accordingly, budget time, finance and personnel.
4. End-users be involved first in brainstorming on issues, content and the development of working drafts, and then have consultants to review.
5. Donors provide opportunities for Francophone and Portuguese-speaking Africa to strategise programmes, build capacities to document experience and distil learnings.
6. A conceptual framework and ethical guidelines be developed to inform editing and selection in all three languages.
7. Principles and strategies in the Briefing Notes are a work-in-progress, so that modifications can be made in later editions of the three languages.
8. To maximise creativity and inputs, language groups be involved in the entire (and not part) resource development of Participatory Adaptation Guides or similar products.

With regards to *EFFECTIVENESS* in resource development, it is recommended that:

1. Since the dissemination strategy has worked so well, a utilisation strategy is also included early on to maximise the use of resources. Larger donor involvement (such as the World Bank, UNICEF and SCF) requires the Alliance to be strategically planned to move Building Blocks to projects on the ground.
2. When field-level persons are involved in content development the Alliance develops clear guidelines towards their participation cost and develops contractual protocols.
3. Donors and resource development agencies realistically plot personnel and time requirements. Guidelines for language, editorial and ethical guidelines should be available when resources are developed. Decentralisation to regions for language adaptations may also be considered.
4. A dedicated Alliance staff member, or a consultant familiar with orphans and vulnerable children issues, languages and the ethical guidelines of the Alliance, work closely with, and provide editorial support to, the publishing team.
5. Management support is available for such projects.
6. The Alliance assesses the individual ability of the field contributors and target support where required. Budget provisions have to be made for such an eventuality.

Some unexpected outcomes were that Building Blocks raised the profile of orphans and vulnerable children issues in Africa, and of the Alliance as a producer of quality documents – not just in the donor world. It has also generated demand for more issues to be added on and a need for capacity building to best use the Briefing Notes and Participatory Adaptation Guides. The need for a utilisation strategy to complement the dissemination strategy emerged. An unanticipated benefit was a better understanding of participatory processes and facilitation for resource development.

In conclusion, the process evaluation informs future work in resource development - ideally supported by a future impact evaluation. Key findings indicate a distinctive way forward where participation and contribution to the content by a wide range of potential end-users is central; that time and complex coordination of people across countries and languages is required, but clearly results in greater ownership, engagement and perhaps better use.

REPORT: BUILDING BLOCKS PROCESS EVALUATION

“The process is a part of the product”¹

The process evaluation of the Building Blocks resources, consisting of the Africa-wide Briefing Notes and the Participatory Adaptation Guides, was initiated to document and analyse a unique process of resource development. The decision to invest in a process evaluation also demonstrates the commitment by both the donor - USAID (and, specifically, the USAID Africa desk) - and the implementing agency – the International HIV/AIDS Alliance, UK - to better understand the participatory processes followed and to learn lessons to inform future work. ²

Begun in September 2001, the Building Blocks resources sought wide stakeholder involvement from policy to grassroots in a planned participatory way. This process was adopted to increase relevance and ownership that would logically maximise the use and reach of the resource material when disseminated.

Broadly, the process evaluation intended to retrospectively answer two questions:

1. Did the process of development meet the plans and stated objectives?
2. What were the lessons learned?

Issues related to the use and reach of the resources were not addressed. The evaluation report is divided into the following sections:

1. **Introduction** - providing an overview of the report, objectives and methodology of the evaluation.
2. **Analysis of findings** - relating to the core principles of the Building Blocks resource development (i.e. participation, relevance of content, effectiveness - management of the process - and planned versus actual implementation).
3. **Lessons Learned** - highlighting the challenges, constraints and successes associated with the process.
4. **Conclusions** - providing recommendations for future work.

The evaluation recognises the efforts and involvement of a large, diverse number of people across countries and continents. It looks forward at the Building Blocks products as only one point in a continuum, which began with a felt need for resources and will conclude at a future date when the products are evaluated for impact. As a result, the process evaluation

¹ Quote from an interview in Building Blocks process evaluation

² This evaluation was carried out by a consultant, Ms. Sonal Zaveri. She would like to thank the Research and Evaluation Team at the International HIV/AIDS Alliance, UK - in particular Sam McPherson, Pepukai Chikukwa and Kim Collins, as well as Kate Harrison (Programme Officer: Children, Children), her assistant Lorna Clarke-Jones, plus other Alliance team members for their excellent support. She would also like to thank the advisory board who gave their time so willingly for the evaluation; Peter McDermott and Amaya Gillespie for agreeing to a face-to-face interview, the Alliance consultants and the development group who, over the phone and e mail, were so helpful in tracking their colleagues across Africa and providing information about the Building Blocks development process.

provides recommendations that are indicative, requiring validation when the impact evaluation takes place.

INTRODUCTION

The process evaluation of the Building Blocks project has been a challenge because of the unique way in which it was developed, involving a very diverse and large number of people, and is still a work-in-progress. The Building Blocks resources, though planned, also grew organically from experience and were simultaneously adapted across three languages - being used as a resource for working with orphans and vulnerable children, for which little programme-related information was available.

The process evaluation methodology and plan was designed to capture this diversity and grew from many discussions with the Alliance's Research and Evaluation Team, Programme staff and the consultant.³

Discussions with the Alliance and a review of available documentation on the process, zeroed-in on the guiding principles of the Building Blocks resource development, providing a framework for developing key questions which could be triangulated across different stakeholders:

- **participation** of many stakeholders across different levels - international, in Portuguese-speaking, Francophone and Anglophone African countries and communities;
- **content** development in three languages and adaptation to local realities;
- complex coordination and **management** of the process over a long period of time with many people in different countries;
- **adaptation of plans** for resource development in response to field experience.

The following sections discuss the objectives, methodology and sample plan of the evaluation.

Objectives of the Process Evaluation

Broad Objectives: to retrospectively assess the process of the development of the Building Blocks products, in order to learn lessons of what worked and what did not, and to inform the wider evaluation of the products.

Specific Objectives:

1. To document the overall process of the development of the Building Blocks products.
2. To assess the main activities that took place as part of the development of the Building Blocks products and to classify these activities.
3. For each activity or event, to assess what worked well and what did not, and to evaluate the effectiveness of the activities against the objectives of the project design.

³ The consultant, in discussion with the Alliance team, developed the revised Process Evaluation Plan during the week of 17 November 2003 in Brighton.

4. To draw overall conclusions about the Building Blocks product development process and to document lessons learned.

Conceptual Framework: Evaluation objectives and Building Blocks Development Rationale⁴

Objectives of Evaluation	Indicators for Building Blocks Development	Areas of enquiry – Core Questions	Tool
1. Document development process 2. To assess main activities and classify them	Efficiency - how were each of the stages implemented, delivery of outputs against plan	Plot timeline, key stages and activities, changes, implications, milestones against plan, management of process. Review of documents	Interviews and questionnaires Review tool
3. To assess what worked well for each activity and evaluate effectiveness against objectives	Relevance (changes in content) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • participation and contribution (ownership) • effectiveness (did it meet objectives) Relates to rationale of Building Blocks development	What were the changes in content as a result of the participatory process? How did these changes influence the relevance and quality of the product? 1. Who participated? How did participation influence the quality of the product? What benefit did the person obtain as a result of this participation? Did it lead to wider discussion and inform future work? 2. Were the objectives met? What were the challenges and constraints? What were the successes? Why? Were there any unexpected outcomes? Review of documents	Interviews and questionnaires Review tool
4. To document lessons learned	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • value addition to community, donors, Alliance, advisory board • quality of product vs. time plus financial and human resources • what worked well and what did not 	1. How did the participatory process of the development and wide stakeholder involvement inform the Alliance, advisory board, development group and community? How will it influence its future work? Was there any value addition? 2. What is your opinion regarding the quality of the product and the time taken? Human resources? 3. What worked well? What did not? What were the constraints? What would you change if you had to do it again? Review of documents	Interviews and questionnaires Review tool

⁴ See Attachment one for Key Questions triangulated across stakeholders.

Methodology

The evaluation primarily used two methods – desk reviews and interviews.

Method	Tool
Desk review	Document Review Tool ⁵
Key informant interviews	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• face-to-face using topic guides• telephone interviews using structured questionnaires with probes• questionnaires by e mail (Questions complement each other across tools)

An introductory e-mail was sent by the Alliance to advisory board members to inform them of the evaluation. Most members were interviewed over the phone. However, Amaya Gillespie (UNICEF) and Peter McDermott (USAID Africa Desk) agreed to face-to-face interviews in New York and Washington, respectively.

Most Alliance team members were interviewed by the consultant during her visit to the UK offices in Brighton - some being followed-up with telephone interviews.

Alliance consultants were interviewed over the phone.

The development group members were sent introductory letters along with questionnaires, which were also translated into French. It was agreed with the Alliance not to tap the Portuguese group because many of the people were no longer available. Also, the French group (which could be traced) would be able to provide the perspective of the different language groups involved.

Tracking people in the development group proved difficult. The evaluation took place about one-and-a-half years after the Briefing Notes were developed. Therefore, most of the people involved had moved or their e-mail address/contact numbers had changed. Complete contact details of those involved in the country-level review were not available due to local people coordinating it. Although the Alliance did update the e-mails and phone numbers (and many still could not be traced), of the 55 questionnaires that were sent out by the consultant using the updated e-mails, 17 bounced back. Faxes were also sent to those without e-mail addresses. Having received only two questionnaires at the end of two weeks, the consultant contacted members over the phone, followed up with e-mails and sought their help to trace others. This personal contact helped greatly - questionnaires were received and interviews conducted over the phone. A few declined to be interviewed or answer the questionnaire - being too busy with end-of-year work. The lesson learned from this exercise is that personal follow-ups help greatly to get responses.

⁵ See Attachment three

Sampling

Group	Universal	Planned	Actual Sample
Advisory board	15 members	50% - 7/8 key members	11+3 key contributors ⁶
Alliance	Director, Programme Officer: Children, other members (3); publishing team (2) ⁷	All Building Blocks Lead Staff	6 (all)
Development group	10 countries – Senegal, Kenya, Angola, Uganda, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Malawi, Mozambique; Mali, Burkina Faso Contact details were available for 38 people	Questionnaires to 30 with expected 50% return rate	Representation from English and French speaking countries (6) 20 respondents ⁸
Alliance Consultants	Language editors (2), initial draft writer (1) and lead consultant (1) ⁹	4	4 telephone interviews + e mails
Total sample = 44.			

⁶ Peter McDermott, Doug Webb, Andrew Chetley, Amaya Gillespie, Eka Williams, Daphetone Siame; Elaine Ireland, Geoff Foster, John Musanje, Dr. Ngagne Mbaye + John Williamson, Linda Sussman, Mark Connolly (key contributors)

⁷ Head Alliance was Jeff O'Malley; Programme Officer was Kate Harrison; Other team members were Tilly Sellers, Beth Mbaka, Pamela Onyango (was busy and could not be interviewed); Publishing team included Matthew Birch and James Togut

⁸ Adaptation Guides Questionnaire English: Catherine Ogolla, Eliud Wakwabubi Jane Mwangi (Kenya) Adaptation Guides Questionnaire French: Henk van Renterghem, Paul Andre Some, Ali Ouedraogo (Burkina Faso)

Briefing Notes Development English: Nczelo Ncube Jackie Nabwire, Mr. Victor K Jere, Mrs. Ellen Jiyani, Mr. Willard Manjolo, (Malawi); Patience Alidri, Lillian Mworeko, Jane Nalubega, Jackie Nabwire, Dorothy Namutamba (Uganda);

Briefing Notes Development French: Dr Idrissa Cissé; (Mali); Yakhya Ba; Charles Becker; Baytir Ka (Senegal);

⁹ Marcia Masiero, Claire Ellis Harris, Kathy Attawell, Grazyna Bonati

EVALUATION FINDINGS - Participation

Because the Building Blocks development is inextricably linked to the process, the evaluation findings therefore:

- **describe** the processes related to participation, content development and management; and
- **analyse** the responses and present lessons learned as well as recommendations.

The Building Blocks process widened its stakeholder involvement and participation on the hypothesis that if people who are end-users of the product are involved in the process, the materials are more likely to be locally relevant, effective and usable. Participation was invited from Anglophone, Portuguese-speaking and Francophone African countries using various mechanisms such as workshops, country-level reviews, field tests and meetings. In addition, an advisory board provided inputs at various stages of the process.

The Process

The advisory board (consisting of 15 members) represented various organisations and expertise related to orphans and vulnerable children work. The advisory board differed in their inputs - brainstorming on orphans and vulnerable children issues, possible approaches for developing the resource, suggestions on who could be involved in workshops and in the review of Briefing Notes. They were involved in the development of the Briefing Notes and not in the Adaptation Guides, being a 'virtual' team, coordinated by the Programme Officer: Children at the Alliance through e-mails and phone calls.

The Uganda workshop (held in May 2002 over 5 days) was a key event where 20 people from Portuguese-speaking, Francophone and Anglophone Africa met to review the first draft of the Briefing Notes. Ten countries were represented - Senegal, Kenya, Angola, Uganda, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Malawi, Mozambique, Mali and Burkina Faso. The criteria for the selection of participants were, preferably, an involvement in orphans and vulnerable children work and a desire to do more (i.e. 'enthusiasts'). The aim of the workshop was to review, revise and validate the Africa-wide briefing notes, which had been drafted in English by a UK-based consultant and translated into French and Portuguese. The Programme Officer: Children facilitated the workshop assisted by a consultant who could speak all three languages. Participants shared experiences (including case studies, illustrations and photographs) and helped with planning the next phases of the Building Blocks project.

The participants of the Uganda workshop agreed to take the process forward to their respective countries and validate the revised versions of the Briefing Notes with people involved in orphans and vulnerable children work. These country-level reviews (coordinated by those who had attended the Uganda workshop) aimed to get in-country stakeholders to comment on the Briefing Notes – to ensure the language was appropriate, strategies realistic and effective, and that examples and case studies given were useful. Any additional inputs of case studies, photographs and diagrams were also invited.

Inputs from the Uganda workshop and the country-level reviews for the Briefing Notes were incorporated first and the working drafts then sent for review to the advisory board.

The Participatory Adaptation Guides were written at the Kenya workshop in September 2002. This was attended by 11 people - three from Mozambique, four from Burkina Faso and four from Kenya. Once again, the Programme Officer: Children facilitated the workshop, assisted by a consultant who spoke all three languages. The group at this workshop was a completely different group of practitioners. A consultant (with expertise in participatory learning and action tools) led each language group, with the other participants being practitioners in either participatory learning and action tools or orphans and vulnerable children (some of whom had attended the Uganda workshop). Each language group worked on two of the six topics during the workshop, and each consultant took the participatory learning and action tools developed for their topics back to their countries for field testing with communities.

Findings Related to *PARTICIPATION*

1. The Building Blocks process was innovative because of the involvement of a wide range of partners, at different levels – international, country and community-level early on in the development.

All who were interviewed (the advisory board and development group members) agreed that, when compared to the way resources are usually developed, the Building Blocks development was unique.

From the advisory board:

"It was a participatory way to develop resources... for the first time so many people within Africa could brainstorm on orphans and vulnerable children"

"Bringing in a consultant and bringing in people for a workshop is not unusual, but it is the different layers of people involved and what happened before and after that was new"

"Most processes are usually linear, but this was more integrated and lessons were being learned at each stage... the scope and complexity was unique"

"A cascade – advisory group, Uganda workshop, country-level review – an important way to generate relevant material. It also creates awareness and, therefore, future use"

"Traditionally, it is expatriate-driven resource development who would not have sensitivity to local issues"

"Generally, a small committee of experts meet in a hotel for 10-12 days and produce a document. Field workers have to use it and the document does not 'fit' with what they want to use... The process of involving field workers, doctors, people working with HIV,

health workers - the process of sharing at national level with CBOs, people with HIV – this was new”

From the development group

“Generally tools are developed by experts or by field experience and then presented to the team for validation. Here, although the first draft was by an expert, it was quickly shared with those in the field”

“We did something relevant and applied what fits our situation – for Africa, for Uganda – not like when someone just sends you a document”

“This was an innovative approach since three teams speaking different languages from different countries – Kenya (English), Senegal (French) and Mozambique (Portuguese) - were brought together to develop the guides based on their country’s own experience”

“There was involvement of stakeholders from different countries to share experiences and lessons learned to improve the delivery of services for children affected by HIV/AIDS”

“What was different was involvement, participation and consultation of users of the resources and inclusion of their views”

The Alliance viewed the Building Blocks participatory process as different (though not unique) to how resources are developed within its organisation. In recent years, the Alliance has experimented with different ways to involve end-users.

The Programme Officer: Children asked the question “what makes a person use a resource?” to guide the development of the Building Blocks resources]. The idea was to make a document that was not ‘glossy, sitting on shelves’ but ‘dog-eared from use’. Documents written by experts were often read superficially, relying on a literature review which necessarily included limited materials and that, too, written by people who had time, skills and connections to get their work in print. The Building Blocks process was to provide practitioners with a rare opportunity to reflect with peers, to unpack their examples of good practice, provide their own examples and case studies, develop skills and capacities in documentation. Most important, the intention was not to provide a toolkit but to give people the basic principles to allow them to make, figuratively speaking, their ‘own building’ from a ‘pile of bricks’.

What was different was that the Alliance invited participants who were not their partners, such as faith based/allied organisations (Kubatsirana, Masiye Camp, Caritas Angola, Family Health Trust, SCOPE) and countries where it does not currently work, such as Mali, Malawi, Angola, Uganda and Kenya.

From the Alliance

“Usually, Alliance toolkits synthesise work done - a summation of experiences of their own partners... the Alliance talking to itself. The Building Blocks was a summation of

other people's experience - a different audience. Because many people developed it, many more would use it – a 'ripple' effect"

"The Alliance is good at involving lot of partners – Building Blocks had a much wider non-Alliance partner input... the dissemination strategy for Building Blocks is a better one with a wide variety of stakeholders and ownership"

“What was innovative was having end-users develop from start to finish, a review in Uganda, added on national experiences, developed the resource in three languages, ten countries coming together...we had to meet the needs of USAID and practitioners, and we looked at what lessons the Alliance had learned”

Donors (USAID) were looking at ways to make information accessible and adaptable to the needs of those who implemented orphans and vulnerable children programmes because many were struggling with similar technical issues.

2. The advisory board stated that their inputs contributed to the Building Blocks development (see different roles in ‘Process’ above) and appreciated the representative nature of the advisory board and the management of the ‘virtual’ team by the Alliance. Some felt that their expertise could have been utilised better.

Members of the advisory board were involved in various capacities - some early on for brainstorming on issues and the conceptual framework, some a bit later for the review of documents. This was partly because the advisory board evolved over a period of time, with some members being included later for their expertise or on the recommendation of others.

The board agreed that because they came from diverse organisations involved in orphans and vulnerable children work, the ‘buy-in’ to the Briefing Notes was wider. There was a good mix of technical expertise and representatives of large organisations and networks. Some board members, knowing when the materials would be available, had advocated and planned their use in workshops. In fact, larger players like UNICEF felt that their networks could have been used much more for wider dissemination of the product.

The advisory board stated that as members of the ‘virtual’ team they were well informed of what was happening with the Briefing Notes, although not about the Participatory Adaptation Guides.

Suggestions from some board members related to how they could have participated and contributed more meaningfully in the resource development:

- at least one formal meeting (subject to availability of funds) early on in the project to go beyond the ‘virtual’ nature of the team and e mails;
- conference calls to reduce the number of large e mails;
- communication among advisory board members so that there was a group rather than individuals - resulting in a greater ‘buy-in’ and an opportunity to contribute more in their area of expertise;
- exploiting their positions in their organisations to get more peer review of the documents within their own organisation and networks;
- feedback about the workshops and the country-level review, or an interaction with some of its participants so board members could give more relevant inputs;
- selective review of Building Blocks documents depending on the advisor’s expertise and choice, leading to better time management and inputs from the advisory board.

From the advisory board

“We were interacting with Kate (Alliance Programme Officer: Children), which was good”

“Did not know inputs from others - what other advisory board members were doing”

“We could have been used as focal points to send the drafts to our regional and country offices, or to our counterparts and so get wide feedback.”

“Too much information over e-mail... difficult to stay in the process, especially when the second, third... e-mails arrive, the quality of our response suffers... maybe a mix of participation and e-mail. We can work in areas we like and not any or all five areas of Building Blocks”

“ Even one meeting of the advisory board would have given me a better sense of how to contribute. E-mail is of limited value – of course you need a budget for such a meeting! We have a lot of experience to share and how much was I really able to contribute?”

The Programme Officer: Children was new at the Alliance when the Building Blocks project started and did not know many of the advisory board members personally. It was difficult to assess how much time and involvement they were likely to give, as this would have been additional to their ongoing work. For example, advisory board members had been invited to the Uganda workshop but only three could attend (Dr. Mbaye, John Musanje and Brenda Yamba).

Others at the Alliance felt that:

- use of advisory board was more ‘structured’ in getting feedback and was globally representative;
 - Advisory members contributed as required but, in retrospect, their involvement could have been strengthened - perhaps made it less ‘virtual’.
3. Facilitation and participation at both workshops – Uganda (for Briefing Notes) and Kenya (for Participatory Adaptation Guides) – were excellent. As a result, participants were able to share experiences, learn about participatory processes, acquire good facilitation skills and build new networks. This contributed to a better ‘engagement’ at the country-level review as well.

Participants appreciated the excellent facilitation by the Alliance of the participative processes used in the workshops and the opportunity to share experiences across countries in Africa. The participants particularly appreciated the opportunity to acquire skills and be involved in resource development, especially where the agency and advisory board involved were international. The networks initiated at the Uganda workshop continued long after.

The Uganda and Kenya workshop reports indicate that participants rated the participation and facilitation very highly.

From the development group

"The team, the mix of people, the atmosphere was great. The facilitators were great - one of the best workshops I have attended"

"How we were involved helped – looked at language we had used and can relate with – looked at case studies which are most relevant. We were involved in other areas but we discussed as a group"

4. At the Uganda workshop most participants were from NGOs and had different professional backgrounds. However, the experience and expertise of the participants varied across language groups affected the quality of their participation.

With 20 places on the workshop, the Alliance had developed criteria for involving participants at the Uganda workshop and consulted to identify the 'right' people - preferably those with both community and managerial experience because writing requires one to stand back and reflect on experience. Attempts were also made to find people with specific subject expertise. The limitation was due to too few personal contacts and knowledge of networks in Africa. Of the participants, there were people living with HIV/AIDS and some from faith-based organisations, but there was more managerial experience rather than direct community experience. Expertise in economic strengthening, psychosocial issues and health and nutrition was limited.

There were no government people involved because none had been identified (although attempts were made in Mozambique and Angola) that fit the criteria or worked with orphans and vulnerable children. In addition, contacting them was difficult as they did not have ready access to e-mail.

Participants (mostly from NGOs) appreciated the diversity of regions, countries and the mix of experience. Some suggestions regarding the representation at the workshop were:

- each of the language groups needed specific subject experts;
- children needed to be involved somewhere in the process, without tokenism;
- government or political decision makers needed to be involved;
- more community experience was needed since orphans and vulnerable children work is chiefly with communities.

The Alliance had not included children because they were not the end-users and there were other resources available - such as the ones that Healthlink Worldwide was developing for children ('child-centred' approaches to HIV/AIDS). It did not want to involve children in a way that was not meaningful. Participants had been encouraged to involve children at the country-level review but this was not written into the ToR.

5. Portuguese-speaking, Anglophone and Francophone Africa participants at the Uganda and Kenya workshops were able to broaden their understanding of orphans and vulnerable children work but communication across language groups was a problem and time-consuming.

Participants felt that it was important to involve the different language groups so that all had a common understanding at the same time. The Francophone¹⁰ and Portuguese-speaking¹¹ participants appreciated being part of the process and learning from the Anglophone countries.

Participants felt that although there was good discussion among each language group, and there was translation across languages during the presentations by the consultant, there was little interaction and sharing between groups due to language problems - both formally and informally. Having bilingual members in each group would have helped.

¹⁰ Information from interviews and Uganda report

¹¹ Information from the Uganda report

From the development group

“Bringing experience from East and Southern Africa into Francophone and Portuguese-speaking Africa was very effective, even if it is not totally adaptable. People like to learn about different contexts and are capable of adapting what is useful”

“Translating later means denying them information. Different ethnic groups can move at the same level. Those who do not have materials do not lose out”

“We did not leave some countries behind – we are moving at the same pace in the crisis that is there – there is an urgency in this situation”

“This is a great move because people will be able to access the tools in the language most convenient to them and understood by them”

The Alliance had made a conscious effort to include the Francophone and Portuguese-speakers from the outset because of the belief that all African countries should be involved – no-one should be left out because of language difficulties. There was also a paucity of any material in French and Portuguese. The advisory board agreed with the Alliance on this issue (see next section on Evaluation Findings - Content No.2).

6. The country-level reviews reached a large number of diverse people because of the high level of commitment of the country coordinators, all of who had been present at the Uganda workshop. It generated more awareness on orphans and vulnerable children issues. Few children and young people were involved in the process.

From the advisory board

“The process of developing and consciously making something more generic and then adapting at country-level – good process”

“There was not just information exchange but engagement which is necessary for such a task”

“There was a recognition that their contribution has value at an international level, an energising activity, it is validation, a positive lesson – sometimes these are ignored”

From the development group

“We got 30 people together from 20 organisations – although few corrections, helped us to bring a common view on orphans and vulnerable children”

“I strongly feel that my contribution and that of others assisted with adding quality and meaning to the content, made the Briefing Notes more representative of the situation on the ground and also made the Notes tackle real life situation issues”

“What worked well – the continuous consultations and involvement of all key stakeholders and they were also able to consult with their organisations in turn”

Some of those involved in the process felt that a ready document restricted inputs for the country-level review. Others felt that more substantial inputs would have been received if people had been brought together at a workshop for a day or two to brainstorm and discuss orphans and vulnerable children issues. Some felt children should have been included.

From the development group

“Because there was a draft, most said it was OK. Although convenient, it is not always the best. Because people are busy the willingness to contribute is very little, but if asked differently, maybe the case studies could have been richer... Bringing together people needs resources... but people need to be taken out of their work situation to give their best”

“We need to consult children – need time and resources. But it would be appropriate to at least bounce issues off children at grassroots”

“A community perspective was needed because all orphans and vulnerable children programmes are community-based and have to be sustainable – very little community dynamics included. Government and NGOs also need to know this”

The Alliance had not written about community mobilisation separately in the Building Blocks process because that is exhaustively covered in another Alliance publication. However, the need to mobilise communities is clearly mentioned in the overview and in different sections of the Briefing Notes. In the Participatory Adaptation Guides the issues around community involvement would be treated more in-depth. The need to involve children was debated early on but discarded because they were not seen as the principal target audience for the Briefing Notes – which was for programme people and policy makers (see No. 4 in this section).

7. All those who participated – advisory board, development group, members of the country-level reviews and Participatory Adaptation Guides – indicated a personal value addition in their work as a result of being part of the Building Blocks development process.

From the advisory board

“Useful at all levels – I was more aware of organisations, resources available, programmes”

“The Zambia Country Office now supports an officer to work with children and this was a direct result of the Building Blocks project”

“It made me think how I can take these aspects in the programmes we are running, how to actually use it - could disseminate it in Zambia and South Africa – a ripple effect - also we would like to address them when we are developing new studies.”

From the development group

"It is very enriching. I am using the strategies in my ongoing work"

"We tend to work isolated in programmes. Forget about government, other NGOs, we identified other resources that could 'fit' – nutritionists, teachers - looked at potential community resources, improved our own database"

"I now know how to involve children – feel more close to children"

"I knew how to handle the physical needs of children but not psychosocial, to advise parents"

8. Workshop members in Uganda and Kenya, as well as country-level review members, felt that others who participated also benefited from the process. For example, in Malawi and Senegal it is being reviewed for government policy on orphans and vulnerable children.

From the advisory board

"The Family Health Trust programme people came back and stepped up the component of family support based on what they had learned and from the field visit in Uganda"

From the development group

"The government (in Malawi) is using it in its review of the National Policy for Youth and Community"

"People felt appreciated to get an opportunity to develop materials. The experience helped them to 'grow' - how do I work on orphans and vulnerable children issues"

"Most people whom I shared this with had experience of working with children. However, their experience in using participative approaches was relatively limited. Also, I suppose, by participating in the process they got training in them also."

Lessons Learned:

1. The participation of many stakeholders has created greater ownership of the products, more awareness of orphans and vulnerable children issues and a greater willingness to disseminate it. In many ways the reach of the Building Blocks was unexpected, as it is being used not only in communities, but also in government policy and as a resource by international organisations and academic institutions, such as Johns Hopkins.

From the advisory board

"Involvement of many people, such as the country-level review, makes people aware but I talk to many people too... we do many activities - work with groups locally so we inform them of this material"

“Quality of document is a separate issue but getting a wide range of people you get many people to talk about it and this is useful”

“Participation leads to a better product - more relevant, more likely to be used” Can I use this in my work”. Experience has shown that if people are involved in the development, they are likely to help get it out and disseminate”

“The process validates the document by saying so many people were involved, creates a constituency and getting names in the document (contributors) has ownership”

From the development group

“We brought a lot of people on board – government, departments, programmes. I promote it wherever I go”

“We have started to adopt it and relate it with what we do; nutrition, psychosocial issues - they come from us; this time it is coming from us here - it is real”

From the Alliance

“Even before the Briefing Notes were out, they were being used in draft form at national level for policy and, therefore, realised early on how valuable it was. They were introduced to national bodies by local practitioners.”

“People have asked for more Briefing Notes and additional products, such as early childhood development - it was well accepted at the skills building at the international conference”

It is recommended that participatory processes (and not just tokenism) be used for resource development since it brings greater engagement, involvement, buy-in and wider use.

2. Having a ‘virtual’ advisory board and communicating through e-mails has its limitations. International advisors, because of the unique position they occupy, can contribute in different and multiple ways.

It is recommended that practical mechanisms be found regarding how the advisory board members can work as a team rather than individual members, keeping in mind the budget and time constraints.

It is recommended that the board members themselves participate in defining how they can participate and contribute, especially when resources are being developed using a participatory, wide stakeholder approach.

3. Workshop facilitators’ use of participatory methodologies helped participants to get hands-on experience when working with others later – in-country (country-level review), within communities (field tests, programmes) and with children (field tests, programmes).

It is recommended that the workshops and other mechanisms for developing resources demonstrate participatory methods and help participants acquire facilitation skills as this will help participants better utilise the resources developed.

4. Who gets involved is important:

- children and young people;
- community representatives;
- political advocates;
- diversifying the expertise and representation in the workshops.

From the advisory board

“Next time, could involve more different levels of participation – was there really enough involvement of policy makers? They may not have necessarily contributed to materials but would have in actuality used it”

“Was there a youth voice or child’s voice?”

From the development group

“We needed to ground our discussions with children. I did it for education and they told me that it is not just access to education for orphans and vulnerable children but a need for relevant education such as life skills”

From the Alliance

“We are developing another resource for children – ‘A parrot on your shoulder’ - in which children would be engaged. End-users for Building Blocks were at national level and programmes are not developed by children – although we did try to find practitioners who were young”

It is recommended that end-users be defined carefully so that their participation is built into the process and that children in orphans and vulnerable children resource development participate meaningfully. End-users can include those who will use the resource, whom it is for as well as who can advocate for it (government representatives).

5. Simultaneous participation of different language groups is valuable and has contributed to a common awareness on orphans and vulnerable children issues and expanded coverage.

It is recommended that Anglophone policy makers, donors and agencies who have access to more and diverse resources, include other language speaking countries in developing resources, capacity building, programmes and sharing experiences.

6. Dialogue and participation of countries with similar languages and cultures needs to be strengthened to share learnings and explore contextual issues.

“Involving other advisors – involving more French speaking members - would have been good because the realities of Eastern and Southern Africa is different from Western and Central Africa” **(from an advisory board member)**

“Three French speaking countries represented a region. Although difficult to do so, Ghana and Cote D’Ivoire have different issues from West Africa” **(from a development group member)**

It is recommended that donors (support agencies) provide an opportunity for dialogue and assistance within similar language speaking countries, and then across other languages - in this way contributing their consolidated experience to shape policy.

7. Participating in resource development had diverse value additions - not only for those who participated but also for whom they involved later or worked with.

It is recommended that donors and resource development agencies provide opportunities for end-users to share experiences, recognising the ‘ripple’ effect on their own work, that of others and on wider networks.

EVALUATION FINDINGS – Related to Content

The process influenced the content of Building Blocks project. The Africa-wide Briefing Notes was a generic resource and the planned Adaptation Guides were intended to generate country-level Briefing Notes. Learnings from the process, the Uganda workshop and country-level reviews indicated the need to develop tools for communities rather than policy makers at country-level. As a result, the proposed content of the Adaptation Guides was changed to include participatory learning and action tools.

This section describes the process by which the Building Blocks content was developed and lessons learned from it.

The Process

USAID initially wanted ‘a pocket book’ - a practical, easy-to-use toolkit for communities that supported and complemented the USAID/UNICEF *Principles to Guide Programming for orphans and other children affected by HIV/AIDS*. The Alliance negotiated for a change with USAID, resulting in the development of the Building Blocks project – a set of Africa-wide Briefing Notes followed by Adaptation Guides to be used at country-level.

Briefing Notes

The Briefing Notes’ five topics of Social inclusion, health and nutrition, economic strengthening, education and psychosocial support (plus an overview) were zeroed-in using multiple channels – brainstorming with USAID, with some advisory board members, at the 2001 International Congress on AIDS in Asia and at the Pacific conference.

A UK consultant¹² did exhaustive literature reviews to write the first Briefing Notes draft in English. These were then translated into French and Portuguese, with all three language versions being reviewed at the Uganda workshop by 20 people from ten countries of Anglophone, Portuguese-speaking and Francophone African countries. The revised documents were then taken for country-level reviews.

Nine of the ten countries invited to the Uganda workshop completed a country-level review. Their comments were synthesised in the UK by a consultant¹³ who spoke all three languages and had facilitated (along with the Alliance) the Uganda workshop.

Inputs from the advisory board for the Briefing Notes were incorporated after the Uganda workshop and reviews.

Participatory Adaptation Guides

¹² Kathy Attawell

¹³ Grazyna Bonati was the lead consultant in the Building Blocks development and spoke all 3 languages.

The concept and design of the Participatory Adaptation Guides underwent a change following the experience of the Uganda workshop and country-level reviews and was discussed with USAID. Instead of country-specific Briefing Notes, the Adaptation Guides would now refer to a set of participatory learning and action tools that would assist communities in translating the Briefing Notes into action. This strategy was adopted because

feedback from reviewers indicated that the generic Briefing Notes could be used directly by different countries in policy and programmes. There was also a need expressed that the Adaptation Guides should be for less literate audiences, as the Briefing Notes were available for the literate ones.

The Guides' conceptual framework, brainstormed at a meeting in the UK in March 2002 and complemented by a desk study of existing approaches for adapting resources, suggested the way forward.¹⁴

The first drafts of the Adaptation Guides were written at a workshop in Kenya, attended by 13 people across three language groups. A consultant with expertise in participatory learning and action tools led each language group, consisting of participatory learning and action tools or orphans and vulnerable children practitioners (some of who had attended the Uganda workshop). Each language group took two topics (from a total of six) to design the participatory learning and action tools, with each consultant then field testing these in their countries. The French and English tools were also field tested at a skills building workshop at ICASA in 2003. This testing had been completed at the time of the process evaluation, but the consolidation of the feedback and cross-translation by the Alliance, to make a full set of six, was pending.

Findings Related to Content

The six Briefing Notes in English, French and Portuguese provide an overview of core principles in orphans and vulnerable children care and support, health and nutrition, social inclusion, psychosocial support, economic strengthening and education. By involving the end-users in reviewing, validating and revising the Briefing Notes, it was expected that content would be contextually relevant and reflect local realities.

1. Both the advisory board and development group felt that the Briefing Notes addressed a huge gap in orphans and vulnerable children resources – it addressed several important sectors (through the five topic areas), did so simultaneously and rooted them in the local realities through case studies and examples. The development group felt that the participatory learning and action tools in Participatory Adaptation Guides were new and useful.

The advisory board and development group identified what they found useful in the Briefing Notes:

- a) Simultaneously, addressing several topics was very useful. There was a lack of material that consolidated the learnings from different sectors and the exhaustive literature review had helped to bring it together in one resource. Some of the areas were 'new' to practitioners such as psychosocial support, economic strengthening and, to some extent, social inclusion, and very much needed to be discussed. Some of these topics (economic strengthening and education) are also out of the 'usual' subject areas of the Alliance.

¹⁴ Andrew Hobbs, Building Blocks, Adaptation Guide Preliminary Work, April 2002.

From the advisory board

"The five topics bridge many sectors ... one can move into what you like - there is no need to prioritise. That is how they are used in workshops. It is well packaged - at the same time they are lean and separate"

"Most relevant issues have been covered. Questions that are being raised about the impact of HIV on children are largely in these areas and carers are asking about them – especially exclusion, stigma and discrimination. Also Building Blocks focuses on younger children - much work is available for older children"

From the development group – for Briefing Notes

"Briefing Notes clearly brought out the need for a holistic approach while addressing the orphans and vulnerable children problem"

"We focus on one aspect - say psychosocial and prevention - but other aspects, such as economic strengthening and education, we do not get involved in. But Briefing Notes helps to bring all the pieces together so even if I concentrate on one, I would look at other aspects as well as it is in a package"

"Don't have too many resources that give programme guidelines. This has set a standard, a foundation – what are the issues we need to look for in orphans and vulnerable children and HOW to do it"

From the development group – For Participatory Adaptation Guides

"What was new (in Participatory Adaptation Guides) was that participatory methodologies were being applied for the first time on orphans and vulnerable children"

"The content was not new – the gap it filled was between theory and practice. The experts' views and the communities' practices - the Participatory Adaptation Guides bridged the two using participatory approaches"

- b) The content has operationalised strategies and principles in a practical way. The language is simple and clear. The case studies and examples reflect the local realities.

From the advisory board

"Within each topic the basics have been given. It sets the scene - doesn't prioritise strategies. Generic resource is important, the local realities are illustrated in the left margin"

From the development group

"There are resources available – like curricula but theoretical. They are not practical and have too much information. They do not say how to impart knowledge and skills –

Building Blocks is interactive and does that. It is easy - starts from what is there and then says how to deal with it"

"There are lots of local level examples, experiences from the community, programmes have been identified and enriched"

2. The Briefing Notes also addressed a language gap by simultaneously bringing out the resources in three languages and adapting, rather than translating, them.

Both the advisory board and the development group expressed the need to get all countries in Africa on the same platform with orphans and vulnerable children issues, even though the Portuguese-speaking and Francophone countries have low HIV prevalence and, therefore, less numbers of children affected or infected with HIV. Their context of work is different as they work with vulnerable children – those who are at risk due to child labour, migration, war, calamities and poverty.

Few resources exist in French and Portuguese that have been produced specifically in Africa. Some Portuguese material is available from Brazil but it is a different context.

Generally materials are produced in English and then translated into French and Portuguese. There is no adaptation to the different cultures and contexts of Western and Central Africa (Portuguese and French speaking countries). The time lag in translation is also one or two years.

The adaptation process has generated a demand for local language translations as well such as Kiswahili and others.

From the advisory board

"The French and Portuguese always feel left out – politically a good step. It increases participation and makes content relevant to more geographical areas"

"Now 'current' in all three languages... having versions at the same time and not three years later changes the likelihood of being used"

From the development group

"Not only do French and Portuguese have their own language version, so we (English) also have our own language – our words are 'very real' not American English"

"Now we know what occurs elsewhere, and to refine strategies of intervention, we need to spread it more" (from Francophone)

"For the French-speaking person all is new - there are practically no participative tools for orphans and vulnerable children programmes – fills an enormous vacuum" (from Francophone)

"The three languages are OK as a starting point but translation to more languages at the country-level may be necessary for effective communication and facilitating applicability of the notes to many"

3. Content changes to the original English draft were few even though the Building Blocks went through a process of adaptation in the different languages. The biggest contribution by the participants was in the case studies and examples.
- a) The Briefing Notes first draft synthesised a lot of available information on the subject.
The consultant appointed by the Alliance who developed the first draft in English used all available published, as well as unpublished material for the literature review.
 - b) The Uganda workshop and country-level reviews intended to reflect the context of Francophone, Portuguese-speaking and Anglophone Africa but substantive changes in the content of the Briefing Notes were few. Participants' contributions were limited by their experience in that area. The comments received were diverse but not necessarily useful, and in some cases had to be deleted.
 - c) Some cross-fertilisation did take place, such as introducing how Islam or religion affects the response to HIV and how poverty affects the vulnerability of children to HIV. Both these issues came from Portuguese-speaking and Francophone Africa where prevalence is low and programmes for children are generally rooted in poverty alleviation programmes.
 - d) In some cases it was the advisory board who provided the inputs. This was particularly so in the 'new' areas of economic strengthening and psychosocial support. Their inputs were so important that they were included in all three language versions.
 - e) For the Alliance it validated that the literature review was clearly researched. The adaptations added a lot of nuances and were more text friendly. Also, the examples and case studies helped to turn the Building Blocks from being based on a 'cold' literature review to a 'friendly one'.

From the development group

"Developing a draft is time-saving but also limited innovation into the document... the same happened at the country-level review"

"We could bring our own experiences and examples"

"Our field experience is limited – we talk more of child issues than HIV... the Briefing Notes were looked at as a resource, but after using the Briefing Notes would have more field-based feedback. Also, for someone who is field-based it is difficult to comment as there is less theoretical orientation. The draft was dominantly South and East Africa experience – it needed to have been written separately in different languages"

4. Having numerous contributors for the content resulted in diverse, though not always useful, comments. Because people did not know what exactly they should keep in they included everything.

In some cases, comments needed to be deleted or modified. For example, the French did not mention how children could participate in decision-making. Some things had to be removed, such as the strategy to support orphanages (instead of having more community-based programmes).

5. Overall the flow was coherent but some felt principles and strategies were confused, while some felt that the English version was clearer and of better quality than the other language versions.

Although the topics discussed in the Briefing Notes resonated with the UNICEF *Principles to guide programming of work with orphans and vulnerable children* and the USAID/UNAIDS *strategies of working with orphans and vulnerable children*, the Briefing Notes actually, according to some members of the advisory board, confused strategies and principles. At the country-level, only a few have indicated confusion.

6. The Participatory Adaptation Guides were developed without a draft, from scratch in three languages which helped in creative thinking. Because each language group produced only two out of six Guides, the groups were not able to field test and learn from the others. Their content was representative of different cultures. Resources developed reflect this framework and approach.

Some also said that the Adaptation Guides might require help from resource persons to help communities use them.

Lessons Learned

1. The Briefing Notes have fulfilled the need for simple, practical resources in orphans and vulnerable children programming. The Briefing Notes have been used in many ways – at country-level, with resource organisations and NGOs.

It is recommended other orphans and vulnerable children issues be identified to develop other practical, simple Briefing Notes.

2. Simultaneous language adaptations, though difficult, are valuable to end-users because in the long run no one gets 'left out' and all are on the same playing field.

It is recommended that donors realise the importance of simultaneous adaptations rather than translations and, accordingly, budget time, finance and personnel.

3. The draft restricted creative inputs in all three language groups. Developing a first draft in English made the content relevant to Anglophone Africa and restricted contributions from Francophone and Portuguese-speaking Africa. In addition, experience from the latter was itself limited.

It is recommended that end-users be involved first in brainstorming on issues, content and develop working drafts, and then have consultants to review. It is also recommended that donors provide opportunities for Francophone and Portuguese-speaking Africa to strategise programmes, build capacities to document experience and distil learnings.

4. When there are many and diverse contributors to content development, editorial responsibility for quality and relevance increases. Coordinating across languages

requires guidelines for editorial inputs especially if it will be represented as an Alliance document.

It is recommended that a conceptual framework and ethical guidelines be developed to inform editing and selection in all three languages.

5. Confusion on principles and strategies is probably a reflection of the current stage of orphans and vulnerable children programming which is relatively new and evolving. Francophone and Portuguese-speaking Africa have less experience in orphans and vulnerable children work than Anglophone, which may be one reason for the difference in clarity.

It is recommended that principles and strategies in the Briefing Notes be a work-in-progress so that modifications can be made in later language editions.

6. Cross-fertilisation of ideas is restricted if language groups are involved in only part of the development of resources.

It is recommended that to maximise creativity and inputs, language groups be involved in the entire, and not part of the resource development of the Participatory Adaptation Guides, or similar products.

EVALUATION FINDINGS -Related to Effectiveness

The Building Blocks development was managed differently. Usually resources are developed from a need expressed by Alliance partners, developed in-house either by the Alliance or by a consultant and then field-tested - usually within the Alliance network. If translations are required they are usually done with the help of a workshop in the region.

The Process

The comments received from the country-level review and workshops were incorporated by the consultant who had been present at the Uganda and Kenya workshops and spoke all three languages. One difficulty was that all comments were not received in time and so there were many revisions to the draft, with any editorial queries being reviewed by the Programme Officer: Children. These drafts were then sent to the publishing team. Because there were French and Portuguese versions, language editors were appointed. It was at this time that the publishing team, editors and the project team had to work together to bring consistency across the Briefing Notes. Also, because they were not translations but adaptations, editorial decisions had to be exercised by the publishing and project teams. As a result, the English version was published first with the French and Portuguese versions being released about six months later. The publishing team developed a new layout for the Building Blocks, with case studies appearing on the left-hand side of the text.

Findings Related to Effectiveness

1. Building Blocks had an in-built dissemination strategy and the Alliance was very successful in getting the Briefing Notes to the people who wanted it - even to those who were not part of the Alliance 'family'. In fact, the Briefing Notes have rapidly been reprinted.

Alliance publications (such as toolkits) have an assured audience - generally their partners. The dissemination of the Building Blocks was unique because it was disseminated more widely and was in great demand because of the wide ownership created during its development. For dissemination, along with the usual Alliance database, every person who enquired about the Building Blocks was automatically logged in, as were all those who participated in the country-level review and workshops in Africa. At the ICASA workshop in 2002, the Briefing Notes were in huge demand and stocks ran out immediately.

2. Coordinating the large number of small contracts for Building Blocks development and consultation required a lot of management coordination and support at the Alliance. who had to develop and manage many small contracts at country-level. This became difficult but the experience has also geared the Alliance for similar work in the future.
3. Preparing multilingual resources for publications - especially as adaptations rather than translations - was difficult because consistency had to be maintained and was time-consuming. The Publications Team had to negotiate editorial decisions in French and Portuguese which affected their own workload. These versions were published six months after the English one.

Both the project and publishing teams at the Alliance felt that maintaining consistency across adaptations became quite complicated with the Alliance having to make editorial decisions. The challenge was trying to retain an individual, cultural flavour without losing out on consistency. This process was also very time-consuming, with editing time quadrupled because of back translation and debate regarding what language should be used. The final edit, therefore, took much longer than anticipated.

The consultant who had facilitated workshops and was familiar with all three languages and issues was not involved at the final editing phase. Although many of the editorial decisions had been taken while incorporating comments from the country-level review and workshops, apparently, there were gaps.

Language editors faced difficulties since there were additions and deletions when compared to the English text. As the English Briefing Notes had been published first, these were used as standard in terms of content and clarity. The readability of the French and Portuguese versions was less clear as a totally different structure was followed. This was especially so in the French version - in the topics of economic strengthening and psychosocial support. This may have occurred because all comments were included without editing during the initial inputs from country-level reviews and workshops, or the people who had provided the feedback did not understand what was expected.

The Alliance has a 'take' or policy on language used, HIV related issues and ethical guidelines. However, the language in the adaptations did not always correspond to this. For example, in French, the translation of 'sex worker' was 'prostitute', or the word 'delinquent' was used. Also, that children should be involved in decision-making was taken out of the French text. There may be examples in Portuguese of such issues as well.

Some suggestions by the Alliance team were:

- developing the Briefing Notes in a modular fashion, in that all Notes are not adapted at the same time but lessons are learned as each one is published;
 - language adaptations to be managed at the regional level – this would have to be considered at some stage as adaptations into, say, Shona or Ndebele, would be possible only locally;
 - local partners could manage language adaptations, in which case the Alliance need not lend its logo and would not, therefore, have to exercise editorial censorship;
 - clear instructions to be given during country-level reviews and workshops so that everything and anything is not incorporated. In other words, consistency and coherence in the document could be checked at the regional and country-level;
 - a glossary of terms to be provided for language adaptations such as for sex worker, HIV positive persons and so on
 - the French of Africa was different from that of France or Switzerland and this was true of Portuguese as well, so it was important for the right, local language editors to be involved.
4. Coordinating and managing feedback, revising and reviewing across ten countries, three languages and diverse stakeholders (including the advisory board) was time-consuming and difficult for the Programme Officer: Children who coordinated and managed information flows. This was very difficult and resulted in delays. This was also a

problem when the advisory board sent comments well past the deadline. The Programme Officer was involved in other Alliance work as well during this period, with Building Blocks demanding considerable time. Clearly, management support is essential for such projects. It was also a challenge because the person managing the project was an English speaker and so the French and Portuguese language groups had to rely on inputs from a consultant rather than direct inputs from the Alliance.

5. Some of the countries needed help in their country-level review and in the Participatory Adaptation Guides field tests to expedite matters. Some had limited capacity to manage the review and, especially, the field tests, with a need for 'hand-holding' from the Alliance. Anticipating such needs would help to budget personnel and time better.

Lessons Learned

1. An in-built dissemination strategy ensured that the Briefing Notes were known by many and generated demand for the resource.

It is recommended that since the dissemination strategy has worked so well, a utilisation strategy also be included early on to maximise the use of resources. Larger donor involvement such as of the World Bank, UNICEF and SCF requires the Alliance to be strategically planned to move the Building Blocks to projects on the ground.

2. Expectations of field-level persons for participating in content development have to be addressed and systems streamlined to manage multiple, small field-level contracts.

It is recommended that when field-level persons are involved in content development, the Alliance develop clear guidelines towards their participation cost and develop contract protocols.

3. Multilingual projects are time consuming and require region-specific language experts to edit. Adaptations particularly require editorial guidelines – what goes in, what goes out – either while it is a work-in-progress or at the final stage of publication. These editorial decisions cannot be made by the publishing team as they are unfamiliar with the issues and context.

It is recommended that donors and resource development agencies realistically plot personnel and time requirements. Guidelines for language and editorial ethical guidelines should be available when resources are developed. Decentralisation to regions for language adaptations may also be considered. It is also recommended that a dedicated Alliance staff member or a consultant familiar with orphans and vulnerable children issues, languages and the ethical guidelines of the Alliance work closely with, and provide editorial support to the publishing team.

4. Managing multi-country and multilingual projects requires a team if work is to be completed effectively and efficiently.

It is recommended that management support be available for such projects.

5. When publications are dependent on field-level inputs, delays in a few places can affect the timeline of the whole publication.

It is recommended that the Alliance assesses the individual ability of the field contributors and target support where required. Budget provisions have to be made for such an eventuality.

EVALUATION FINDINGS - Related to Planning and Implementation

The key events most mentioned by the advisory board and development group were the:

- Uganda workshop;
- country-level reviews; and
- Kenya workshop (by those who had attended it).

It was the participatory nature and wide consultation bringing in grassroots examples and realities that was considered as key in these events.

Some of the unexpected outcomes were:

1. The wide use of Briefing Notes at community-level, national policy level and globally. In fact, there is a demand for more issues to be covered in the same manner as the original five Briefing Notes. In fact, a Briefing Note for elderly carers is already in the pipeline and there is a demand for early childhood development issues to be handled.
2. USAID recognises, as do the advisory board, the capability of the Alliance to produce a quality document.
3. Orphans and vulnerable children issues were discussed across Africa raising the profile of these issues. It automatically sensitised people on the relevant issues as well as introducing the 'new' ones like psychosocial support or the unfamiliar ones such as 'economic strengthening'.
4. Wider use has also generated a demand for more local language translations.
5. Those who have used it would like to help others use it such as other Francophone countries not involved in the development of the Building Blocks, plus other groups. There is an emerging need for capacity building to use the resources.
6. There may be a need for a utilisation strategy for both the Briefing Notes and Participatory Adaptation Guides. At country-level, there is an expressed demand for help in using the documents, especially for those who were not part of the process (see point five above). Although the Alliance had consciously expanded its database for dissemination both electronically and at the International Conference on AIDS and STIs in Africa, donors and the advisory board (having seen the product) felt their own networks could be utilised better, with the larger players, such as the World Bank, being roped-in as well. (Also see No. 1 *Lessons Learned in Evaluation Findings – Effectiveness*)

"The gap is not in the resources alone, but in the resources and materials needed to train people and this is particularly so in orphans and vulnerable children work. We have had training in HIV but not orphans and vulnerable children and this is important if we want people to use it – this is where the gap comes"

"Potentially big clients should be brought on board early on – a strategic aggressive marketing plan before it (product) exists"

The Briefing Notes followed the timeline more or less as planned except for the delay in producing¹⁵ the French and Portuguese adaptations (see findings related to effectiveness).

The Participatory Adaptation Guides' concept and design were changed to become participatory learning and action tools to be used directly by communities to make action plans. They had originally been planned to become country-level Briefing Notes. This has resulted in a delay to May 2004 rather than June 2003.

When questioned about the time delay, most (both the advisory board and Building Blocks members) felt that a time lag was acceptable when quality documents were produced. At policy level, it was felt that a time delay would cause little difference but at the programme level the effect may be more.

A few questioned the delay because that meant the Briefing Notes could not be used to their full potential, that the momentum may be lost and that having the Notes and Participatory Adaptation Guides as two different tools would require some assistance in helping people understand how they could both be used. Since many at the field-level would not know that the Guides were to be published, a reorientation would be required of the Briefing Notes. This, according to one Alliance interview, could unexpectedly renew the interest (a year later) in the Briefing Notes as well. Those who developed the Guides were also eager to learn what worked and what did not on the ground.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the process evaluation informs future work in resource development, hopefully supported by a future impact evaluation. Key findings indicate a distinct way forward where participation and contribution to the content by a wide range of potential end-users is central - that time and complex coordination of people across countries and languages is required but, clearly, results in greater ownership, engagement and, perhaps, better use.

¹⁵ See attachment two for Plan and Objectives of the Briefing Notes and PAG.

Annex 1: Strategic Core Areas and Questions

The following is a set of questions that explores strategic core areas that guided the development of the Building Blocks.

Building Blocks.

Core Areas in Building Blocks Development	Advisory Board	Alliance Team	Development Group		Consultants
			Workshops (Uganda, Kenya)	Country-Level Review/Field Tests	
Participation: The Building Blocks process widened its stakeholder involvement and participation on the hypothesis that if people who are end-users of the product are involved in the process, the materials are more likely to be locally relevant, effective and usable.					
1. What was new or innovative in the approach in comparison to the usual resource development process?	X	X	X	X	X
2. What was your role in the Building Blocks development and how did you feel you influenced it? Please explain. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• In designing and conceptualizing the project and broad areas?• In developing and adapting the Briefing notes?• In developing and adapting the Adaptation Guide?• In revising the Briefing Notes and/or Adaptation Guides?• In managing the process?• Any other?	X	X	X	X	X
3. How did other members of your group ¹⁶ contribute to the process? How did their participation influence the quality and relevance of the products?	X	X	X	X	
4. What was the participation and contribution of the following groups to the Building Blocks development process (other than yours)? How did their participation influence the quality and relevance of the products? <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Advisory Group• Workshop members in Uganda (for Briefing Notes) and Kenya (for Adaptation Guides)• Country-level review groups	X	X	X	X	X
5. How were participants/contributors selected? What were the criteria? Who got left out? Why?	X	X		X	
6. How could participation have been strengthened in terms of process – within the group, between groups, at critical points?	X	X	X	X	
7. How could participation been strengthened in terms of membership in the groups? How would it have influenced the process and the products?	X	X	X	X	
8. What added value/learning/benefit did the person or the organization receive as a result of one's participation? Better understanding? Added or improved skills? In future work? Any other?	X	X	X	X	
9. What added value do you think the other groups received?	X	X	X	X	
Lessons Learned					
The Building Blocks process widened its stakeholder involvement and participation – in terms of variety of stakeholders, community involvement and the number of persons.					
10. How did the process of participation affect the products – content, future use and reach? What were the greatest strengths and successes in this process?	X	X	X	X	X
11. What were the greatest challenges and constraints?	X	X	X	X	X
12. What would you do different the next time around?	X	X	X	X	X

¹⁶ If this is addressed to an advisory board member, it refers to other members of the board; if it refers to an Alliance member, it refers to other members of the Alliance Building Blocks management team

Content (relevance): Briefing Notes and Adaptation Notes (called Building Blocks resources or Building Blocks products) The Building Blocks products in English, French and Portuguese include generic Briefing Notes that provide an overview of core principles for orphans and vulnerable children care and support and a set of locally adapted Participatory Adaptation Guides to translate the Briefing Notes into practice at the local level. By involving the end-users in reviewing, validating and revising the Building Blocks products, it was expected that content would be contextually relevant and encourage wider use.					
13. How was the need for Building Blocks resources determined?	X	X			
14. What topics or broad areas were selected? Why?	X	X			
15. What gaps were intended to be addressed? What was 'new'?	X	X			X
16. How was the structure/format of the Building Blocks determined (issues, principles, strategies, community adapted tools)? What is your opinion regarding the 'flow' or coherence of the content?	X	X	X	X	X
17. How does it resonate with and contribute to Principles of Work with orphans and vulnerable children?	X	X	X	X	X
18. Who determined the selection of topics and inclusion during adaptation? What criteria were used?	X	X			X
19. Translations: What was the value addition in production in three languages (English, French, Portuguese)? How did it influence participation and content?	X	X	X	X	X
20. Who defined criteria for inclusion across languages?	X	X			X
21. How were local country-specific issues included (or not) especially because this was a generic manual?	X	X			X
22. To what extent was the process able to incorporate content that reflected local realities?	X	X	X	X	X
23. How did the process of adaptation and revision affect the product – content, future use and reach? What 'new' ideas were incorporated?	X	X	X	X	X
Lessons Learned (the Building Blocks products were revised and adapted to reflect locally context and language)					
24. What in the process of change/adaptation and mechanisms used, such as country-level reviews, field tests and workshops work out well? What did not work out so well?	X	X	X	X	X
25. What could be done better or strengthened? What would you do different the next time around	X	X	X	X	X
Effectiveness: By involving communities most affected by the HIV at different stages, the Building Blocks process intended to increase the effectiveness of communities and other local-level organizations to assist children affected by AIDS.					
26. How was the process monitored against achieving objectives at each stage?	X	X			
27. How was the information flow managed from various countries? What were the problems? How was consensus built?	X	X	X	X	
28. How was the coordination of the outputs from various mechanisms - Advisory Group feedback, workshops, country-levels reviews, designing, getting and incorporating feedback - managed? What were the challenges?	X	X			
29. How will the long process and a change in timeline in getting the products out affect their value and use in policy and programmes at the country and local level?	X	X	X	X	
Lessons Learned (the Building Blocks process used over two years an elaborate planning process across ten countries in Africa including various mechanisms such as an Advisory Group, workshops, and meetings to develop the products)					
30. What was key in managing and coordinating this effort and worked out well and contributed to the product development? What did not work out so well?	X	X	X	X	
31. How useful was the process in relation to the process meeting its objectives - increasing ownership, quality of the document, and its future use?	X	X	X	X	
32. What would you do different the next time around?	X	X	X	X	

Annex 2: Table containing Building Blocks development Stage, Objectives and Activities

Stage	Objectives	Activities	Product	Planned completion date	Actual completion date
1. Design Project	Establish: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Whether the initial concept is good and useful - How the resource might be used and by whom - What topics should be included - What exists already - Which organisations will contribute to developing the resource - A plan for monitoring reach and impact 	1.1 Communicate with key experts (10 people) 1.2 Desk review of existing literature including gray literature 1.3 Review of methods for monitoring reach and impact	Project design (English, French and Portuguese). It will include a finalised topic list, list of contributors and draft M&E plan	Dec 01	November 01
2. Develop Africa-wide briefing notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Complete initial work on content and suitable design and layout format 	2.1 Write initial draft of briefing notes, send out for review, including country-level review develop into Draft 1 ready for meeting (25 people) 2.2 Translate into French and Portuguese	Draft 1 of Africa-wide briefing notes on c5 topics, including preliminary design and layout ideas, reviewed as above in English, French and Portuguese	Feb 02	April 02
3. Review and edit Africa-wide briefing notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review for content, presentation and fit with different local contexts - Confirm potential users - Agree plan for country-level review - Agree feedback mechanism 	3.1 Africa-wide workshop in the three languages (30 people)	Workshop report Draft 2 Africa-wide Briefing Notes	April 02	May 02
4. Country-level Review of Africa-wide Briefing Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identify any further changes suggested by country-level users 	4.1 Meeting participants, hold group discussions in their own country settings (300 people) 4.2 Feedback to Alliance		July 02	June 02
5. Production of Africa-wide Briefing Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Make final adjustments to content and design based on feedback 	5.1 Alliance uses feedback to make final adjustments 5.2 Produces final printed version of briefing notes	Production of Africa-wide Briefing Notes – initial print run of 4,000 – 2,000 immediate distribution, 2,000 with Adaptation Guides	Aug 02	5.1: Eng: Oct 02, Fren: Jan 03, Port: Jan 03 5.2: Eng: Jan 03, Fren: May 03, Port: May 03
6. Develop Adaptation Guides	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identify effective activities for helping practitioners and trainers to develop briefing notes appropriate for their own local context based on Africa-wide briefing notes 	6.1 Write initial draft of Adaptation Guides, send out for review, develop into Draft 1 ready for workshops Changed plans informed USAID –UK meeting in March 02, with a collaborative writing workshop in Nairobi Sep 02	Draft set of Adaptation Guides for developing the briefing notes into locally relevant guidelines on c5 topics	March 02	Plans changed – meeting in March 02, draft 1 written in Nairobi workshop Sep 02

Stage	Objectives	Activities	Product	Planned completion date	Actual completion date
7. Review Adaptation Guides	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Core trainers understand the principles of activities which enable end-users to develop their own briefing notes - Preparation and planning for 3 workshops, including adapting the guides - Identify mechanisms for follow up 	7.1 Meetings with core trainers prior to each workshop Changed plans, informed USAID – had one joint writing meeting in Nairobi, rather than three	Adaptation and workshop preparation reports	Aug 02	Sep 02
8. Field-test Adaptation Guides	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - End-users successfully use Adaptation Guides to develop their own locally relevant briefing notes 	8.1 3 workshops, sequentially, in English, French and Portuguese (90 people – some of whom may be children and young people) Changed plans, informed USAID, held 3 review meetings in Mozambique, Burkina and Kenya	Workshop reports giving feedback on Adaptation Guides Locally adapted briefing notes (product for each participant) These were not produced	Nov 02	Jan 03
9. Follow-up participants from the 3 workshops	Find out: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If people use the guidelines they have developed and how they use them - If they help to increase the quality of work being planned and implemented. - Users views on the benefit of developing local context briefing notes 	9.1 Feedback from core trainers 9.2 Finalise Adaptation Guides Draft tools have been produced in English, French and Portuguese, not yet finalised	Report on feedback from core trainers	Dec 02	N/A
10. Production of Adaptation Guides	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Make final adjustments to content and design based on feedback - Finalise choice of independent evaluator (see 12) 	10.1 Alliance uses feedback to make final adjustments 10.2 Produces printed version of Adaptation Guides, with briefing notes Draft tools have been produced in English, French and Portuguese, not yet finalised	Adaptation guides produced as a package, combined with Africa-wide briefing notes - initial print run 2,000	Dec 02	N/A
11. Disseminating the resource	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Maximise use and reach of resource at sub-national level across Africa 	11.1 Distribute resource via organisations involved in project 11.2 Assistance to plan and, if necessary, leverage funds for continued dissemination and monitoring of the resource	Report showing plans of organisations to disseminate and monitor the resource	Feb 03	Jan 03 Distribution plans rather than reports
12. Independent Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Evaluating use and reach of resource at sub-national level across Africa (including, if possible, comparison of Africa-wide Briefing Notes used alone vs. used with Adaptation Guides) 	12.1 Qualitative & quantitative evaluation methods developed and used (100 - 200 people) Plans changed – decided to do this over a longer period, beginning with process	Evaluation report	June 03	N/A

Stage	Objectives	Activities	Product	Planned completion date	Actual completion date
		evaluation in Oct 03. Informed USAID.			

Annex 2a: Table showing revised objectives and activities for Participatory Adaptation Guides (PAGS)

Stage	Objectives	Activities	Product	Completion Date
1. Develop Adaptation Guides	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identify “key questions” to guide a process of community assessment, reflection and planning - Identify and describe participatory learning and action tools, plus activities for each topic - Decide on content and design of the “Building Blocks in Practice” manual 	Write initial draft of Participatory Adaptation Guides	Draft set of Participatory Adaptation Guides. Report outlining content and design of “Building Blocks in Practice” manual.	Sept 02
2. Field Test Adaptation Guides	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Participatory Adaptation Guides are field-tested in each language, with adjustments incorporated into draft 2 	Field tests in each country involved in writing the first drafts - Kenya, Mozambique and Burkina Faso	Field test reports and draft 2 produced	Feb 03
3. Revised versions translated into English	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - English versions available for review and revision from participatory learning and action tools experts 	Translation	English drafts of all tools	March 03
4. Participatory learning and action tools - consultant to review and revise drafts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All tools reviewed and revised to ensure they can be used with non-literate groups 	Develop ToR for consultant Work with consultant to review and revise tools	Reviewed and revised tools in English	Jan 04
5. English guides translated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Translations which reflect local language styles of African audiences 	Done in Mozambique and Burkina Faso with final review from participants in Nairobi workshop.	Final versions of English, French and Portuguese versions ready for printing	March 04
6. Resource produced	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Manual developed to incorporate Briefing Notes and PAGS 	Work with communication team to produce resources	Manuals printed in English, French and Portuguese	May 04

Annex 3: Summary Of Africa-Wide Briefing Notes Documents

Documents	Issues discussed	Major Recommendations
Final Draft Concept Note Africa Bureau orphans and vulnerable children 23 Nov, 01	Provides a background for development of Building Blocks, includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • issues – children and families infected and affected by HIV/AIDS • strategies for intervention • scope of work • rationale for project design • description of products, development and dissemination Has an objectives, product, timeline matrix	Suggests a later process documentation and evaluation of Building Blocks – Briefing Notes and the Adaptation Guides
USAID Building Blocks FY 2002 Report	Progress of the Building Blocks and Adaptation Guides – development stage and interest being generated	
Uganda workshop Report May 2002	A five-day meeting in Mukono to review, revise and validate a series of Briefing Notes (5 + overview). Twenty participants from 10 countries (Senegal, Mali, Burkina Faso, Malawi, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Kenya, Uganda, Mozambique and Angola) attended representing Francophone, Portuguese speaking and Anglophone Africa. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Language editing took up most of the time, especially for the French. • First draft (prepared in UK) itself was good so little revision 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. More time is needed to review and revise such documents. 2. Groups advised how to take forward the country-level review. 3. Each country could be responsible for one or two topics for better quality output. 4. Documents could be sent early on to save time in workshop for discussion
Report on Collating and Integrating country-level review changes into the Building Blocks Documents	What the different comments were from country-level review and significant differences Editorial questions for the Alliance in each topic and language	the Alliance suggested specific changes; consulted others regarding changes
Kenya workshop report October 2002	A five day meeting in Nairobi to develop Participatory Adaptation Guides. Three language specific facilitators guided the participants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • English – 4 participants from Kenya • French – 4 participants from Burkino Faso • Portuguese – 3 participants from Mozambique Each group prepared participatory learning and action tools tools for 2 Briefing Notes and plans for field-testing them were made.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Different language groups had different styles in writing and so standardization in translation across languages would be required. 2. Developing participatory learning and action tools tools with this methodology was effective.
Adaptation Guides Development Meeting 7 Aug 2002	What the PAG would be – content, participatory learning and action tools, children issues How would it be developed – Kenya workshop outline, participants	
Building Blocks Adaptation Guides Preliminary Work (a report by Andrew Hobbs), April 2002	Reviewed models demonstrating an adaptation process; developed a possible outline structure for Building Blocks Adaptation Guide; identified what the 'guide' should include – practicality, ethos –right based, guidance on research, clear participatory processes, case studies.	Recommendations for PAG and the workshop

Annex 4: Evaluation Matrix

Evaluation findings	Lessons learned	Recommendations
1. Related to participation		
1.1 The Building Blocks was innovative because of the involvement of a wide range of partners, at different levels – international, country and community early on in the development.	The participation of many stakeholders has created greater ownership of the products, more awareness of orphans and vulnerable children issues and greater willingness to disseminate it. In many ways the reach of the Building Blocks was unexpected, as it is being used not only in communities, but in government policy and as a resource by international organisations and academic institutions such as Johns Hopkins.	It is recommended that participatory processes (and not just tokenism) be used for resource development since it brings greater engagement, involvement, buy-in and wider use. A small note regarding the Building Blocks process could be included in the products.
1.2 The advisory board stated their inputs contributed to the Building Blocks development, (see different roles in Process above), appreciated the representative nature of the advisory board and the management of the 'virtual team' by the Alliance. Some felt that their expertise could have been utilised better.	Having a virtual advisory board and communicating through e mails has its limitations. International advisors, because of the unique position they occupy, can contribute in different and multiple ways.	It is recommended that practical mechanisms be found regarding how the advisory members can work as a team rather than individual members, keeping in mind the budget and availability of time. It is recommended that the advisory board, themselves, participate in defining how they can participate and contribute, especially when resources are being developed using a participatory, wide stakeholder approach.
1.3 Facilitation and participation at both workshops – Uganda (for Briefing Notes) and Kenya (for PAG) – were excellent. As a result, participants were able to share experiences, learn about participatory processes, acquire good facilitation skills and build new networks. This contributed to a better 'engagement' at the country-level reviews as well.	Workshop facilitators' use of participatory methodologies helped participants to get hands-on experience when working with others later – in-country (country-level review), in communities (field tests, programmes) and with children (field tests, programmes).	It is recommended that the workshops and other mechanisms for developing resources, demonstrate participatory methods and help participants acquire facilitation skills as this will help participants utilise the resources developed better.
1.4 At the Uganda workshop, most participants were from NGOs and had different professional backgrounds. However, the experience and expertise of the participants varied and affected the quality of their participation.	Who gets involved is important such as: 1. children and young people 2. community 3. political advocates 4. diversifying the expertise and representation in the workshops	It is recommended that end-users be defined carefully so that their participation is built into the process and that children in orphans and vulnerable children resource development participate meaningfully. End-users can include those who will use the resource, whom it is for as well as, and who can advocate for it (government representatives).
1.5 Portuguese-speaking, Anglophone and Francophone African participants at the Uganda and Kenya workshops were able to broaden their understanding of orphans and vulnerable children work in Africa but communication across language groups was a problem and time-consuming.	Simultaneous participation of different language groups is valuable and has contributed to a common awareness on orphans and vulnerable children issues and expanded coverage.	It is recommended that Anglophone policy makers, donors and agencies who have access to more and diverse resources, include other language speaking countries in developing resources, capacity building programmes and sharing experiences. New technology for simultaneous translation using mobile, radio microphones and receivers would facilitate this process.
1.6 The country-level reviews reached a large number of diverse people because of the high level of commitment of the country coordinators - all of whom had been present at the Uganda workshop. It generated more awareness on orphans and vulnerable children issues. Few children and young people were involved in the process.	Dialogue and participation of countries with similar languages and cultures needs to be strengthened to share learnings and explore contextual issues	It is recommended that donors and support agencies provide opportunities for dialogue and assistance within similar language speaking countries. Subsequently, in this way, across other languages, contributing their consolidated experience to shape policy.
1.7 All those who participated – advisory board, development group, country-level review members, PAG – indicated a personal value addition in their work as a result of being part of		

the Building Blocks development process.		
1.8 Workshop members in Uganda and Kenya, as well as country-level review members, felt that others who participated also benefited from the process. For example, in Malawi and Senegal, it is being reviewed for government policy on orphans and vulnerable children	Participating in resource development had diverse value additions, not only for those who participated but also whom they involved later or worked with.	It is recommended that donors and resource development agencies provide opportunities for end-users to share experiences, recognising the 'ripple' effect on their own work, that of others and on wider networks.
<i>2. Related to Content</i>		
2.1 Both the advisory board and the development group felt that the Briefing Notes addressed a huge gap in orphans and vulnerable children resources – it addressed several important sectors (through the 5 topic areas), did so simultaneously and rooted them in the local realities, through case studies and examples. The development group felt that the participatory learning and action tools in the Participatory Adaptation Guides were new and useful.	The Briefing Notes have fulfilled the need for simple, practical resources in orphans and vulnerable children programming. The Briefing Notes have been used in many ways – at country-level, with resource organisations and NGOs.	It is recommended other orphans and vulnerable children issues be identified to develop other practical, simple Briefing Notes.
2.2 The Briefing Notes also addressed a language gap by simultaneously bringing out the resources in 3 languages and adapting, rather than translating, the resource.	Simultaneous language adaptations, though difficult, are valuable to end-users because, in the long run, no one gets 'left out' and all are on the same playing field.	It is recommended that donors realise the importance of simultaneous adaptations rather than translations and accordingly budget time, finance and personnel.
2.3 The Portuguese and French Building Blocks went through a process of adaptation but there were few content changes from the original English draft. The major changes in the language versions referred to the case studies and examples contributed by the participants.	The draft restricted creative inputs in all 3 language groups. Developing a first draft in English made the content relevant to Anglophone Africa and restricted contributions from Francophone and Portuguese-speaking Africa. In addition, experience from Francophone and Portuguese-speaking Africa was itself limited.	It is recommended that end-users be involved first in brainstorming on issues, content and develop working drafts; the have consultants to review. It is recommended that donors provide opportunities for Francophone and Portuguese-speaking Africa to strategise programmes, build capacities to document experience and distil learnings.
2.4 Having numerous contributors for the content resulted in diverse, though not always useful, comments. Because people did not know exactly what they should keep in, they included everything. In some cases, they needed to be deleted or modified substantially.	When there are many and diverse contributors to content development, editorial responsibility for quality and relevance increases. Coordinating across languages requires guidelines for editorial inputs, especially if it will be represented as an Alliance document.	It is recommended that a conceptual framework and ethical guidelines be developed to inform editing and selection in all three languages.
2.5 Overall the flow was coherent but some felt principles and strategies were confused. Some felt that the English version was clearer and of better quality than the other language versions.	Confusion on principles and strategies is probably a reflection of the current stage of orphans and vulnerable children programming which is relatively new and evolving. Francophone and Portuguese-speaking Africa have less experience in orphans and vulnerable children work than Anglophone, which may be one reason for the difference in clarity.	It is recommended that principles and strategies in the Briefing Notes be a work-in-progress, so that modifications can be made in later editions of the 3 languages.
2.6 The Participatory Adaptation Guides were developed from scratch in 3 languages. Without a draft this helped creative thinking. Because each language group produced only two out of the six Participatory Adaptation Guides they were not able to field test and learn from the other Guides.	Cross-fertilisation of ideas is restricted if language groups are only involved in part of the development of resources.	It is recommended that to maximise creativity and inputs, language groups be involved in the entire, and not part resource development of Participatory Adaptation Guides or similar products.

3. Related to Effectiveness		
3.1 Building Blocks had an in-built dissemination strategy and the Alliance was very successful in getting the Briefing Notes publications to the people who wanted them, even to those who were not part of the Alliance 'family'. In fact, the Briefing Notes have been rapidly reprinted.	An in-built dissemination strategy ensured that the Briefing Notes were known by many and generated demand for the resource.	It is recommended that since the dissemination strategy has worked so well, a utilisation strategy also be included early on. Larger donor involvement such as the World Bank, UNICEF and SCF, requires the Alliance to be strategically planned to move the Building Blocks to projects on the ground.
3.2 Coordinating the large number of small contracts for Building Blocks development and consultation required a lot of management coordination and support at the Alliance.	Expectations of field-level persons for participating in content development have to be addressed and systems streamlined to manage multiple, small, field-level contracts.	It is recommended that when field-level people are involved in content development, the Alliance develop clear guidelines towards their participation cost and develop contract protocols.
3.3 Preparing multilingual resources for publications, especially as adaptations and not translations, was difficult because consistency had to be maintained and was time-consuming. The Publications Team had to negotiate editorial decisions in French and Portuguese, which affected their own workload. These were published six months after the English one.	Multilingual projects are time-consuming and require region-specific language experts for editing. Adaptations particularly require editorial guidelines – what goes in, what goes out – either while it is a work-in-progress or at the final stage of publication. These editorial decisions cannot be made by the publishing team as they are unfamiliar with the issues and context.	It is recommended that donors and resource development agencies realistically plot personnel and time requirements. Guidelines for language, editorial ethical guidelines should be available when resources are developed. Decentralisation to regions for language adaptations may also be considered. It is recommended that a dedicated Alliance staff member or a consultant familiar with orphans and vulnerable children issues, languages and the ethical guidelines of Alliance, work closely with, and provide editorial support to the publishing team.
3.4 Coordinating and managing feedback, revising and reviewing across ten countries, 3 languages and diverse stakeholders (including the advisory board) was time-consuming and difficult for the Programme Officer: Children.	Managing multi-country and multi-lingual projects requires a team if work is to be completed effectively and efficiently.	It is recommended that management support be available for such projects.
3.5 Some of the countries needed help in their country-level review and in the field tests to expedite matters.	When publications are dependent on field-level inputs, delays in a few places can affect the timeline of the whole publication.	It is recommended that the Alliance assesses the individual ability of the field contributors and target support where required. Budget provisions have to be made for such an eventuality.